Mr. Javed Ahmad Ghamidi vs. Ali Sina Part 12

Javed Ahmad Ghamidi and Khalid Zaheer vs. Ali Sina Part VI

Ali Sina's response:

Dear Professor Zaheer and Dr. Ghamidi

The fact that I rested my case on the question of intercession does not mean I have "conceded". It means that the case, as far as I am concerned, is explained thoroughly and I saw no new information presented by you that needed to be addressed. However, since you raised the point again I will explain what I believe to be obvious.

You stated that verses 4:17-18 talk about three categories of people. A) those who sin and repent immediately. B) Those who sin but don't repent until they are near their death and C) Those who do not believe in Allah and never repent. Then you said that the situations of A and C are clear, but what will happen to people in category B is not explained in the Quran. You added:

What if a person belonging to such a category was to seek justice from God Almighty on the Day of Judgment? And what if another person, let's say my ordinary self, was to ask the Almighty to forgive him? What objections can be raised against the possibility that such an event will take place before the Almighty makes a clear pronouncement to that effect? Intercession will be nothing more than a request tendered by some individuals to the Almighty to forgive those people whose case will be unclear on the basis of the principles of justice clearly outlined by the Almighty.

The reason I did not see a need to answer this argument is because I had already answered it. I do not believe in overkill nor do I consider it scholarly. My objective is to clear the misconceptions and not to rob the nose of my opponents to the ground. I get no pleasure in doing that, unless my opponent has been overtly obnoxious and arrogant. Then humiliating him publicly is therapeutic for his inflated ego. In this case my opponents are two very respectful scholars. My disagreement with you is in the form and not in the substance. The substance is love for humanity, tolerance and respect for human life. In this we both agree. Our differences, although not insignificant, are secondary.

Anyway, in my earlier message, I asked what possibly a creature of God like your good self can tell his maker that he already does not know? Are you claiming to be wiser, more compassionate and more merciful than God? Suppose I am a sinner who have sinned out of ignorance and weakness and not out of malice and really deserve forgiveness. Doesn't God know this already? Why he needs you to tell him what he already knows? Are you kinder to me than him? Do you know the secrets of my heart, my weakness and my sincerity better than him? I hope you responded in the negative to all these questions. So isn't it

presumptuous to tell God how to run his business? You want to be more companionate than God. This is even worse than trying to be more catholic than pope.

You are not kinder than God, nor wiser than him, and not privy to the secrets of people's hearts. So what qualifies you to tell the creator of the universe what he should do with me? Assuming that there a life after death and there is a God that punishes and rewards, it is only logical that you seek forgiveness for yourself and I ask forgiveness for myself. It would be arrogant for us miser creatures to tell God what to do as if we know better.

Now, the problem does not end there. Muhammad also thought that not only God would listen to his prayers but he would also listen to his curses. In the verse 3.61 he challenged his opponents to face him in a "cursing tournament" to see who is right. He said, **come on, let us call our sons and your sons and our women and your women and our near people and your near people, then let us curse each other to find out who is telling the truth.** Wow! What a fool proof system to find the truth.

But don't be fooled yet. Muhammad might have impressed his gullible followers with these empty threats but in real life he was more pragmatic than to relay on mere curses. He did not just sit there cursing his opponents waiting for Allah to act. He got into action himself. He sent spies to the towns of his to be victims to assess the situation and cowardly ambushed them when they were least expecting.

About 8 years ago a credulous Muslim challenged me to the same. I encouraged him to sit and curse. I told him that Muhammad's cursing seasons lasted thirty days and recommended that he should not stop cursing until his wish is granted. Looks like Allah has not been attentive to this poor Muslim's curses. Maybe more Muslims have to join the battle and curse me in congregation. How about a big Ummah day of cursing all the enemies of Islam? That is an idea! Hey, it is in the Quran, so it must work. Alas few Muslims believe in the power of cursing and instead, like their prophet, they resort to terrorism and violence to prove their points.

Do you really think that the maker of this magnificent universe is a toy in the hands of his creatures? Now if this is really Allah who is making that call, don't you think that he is a fool? Why would he need people to curse each other? If he already knows who is right and who is wrong, why he dose not punish the wrong party, assuming that this is the only way he knows how to make his truth prevail?

This verse depicts Allah as a despicable being who instead of reason resorts to violence to prove he has the ultimate power. This verse alone is enough to prove that Muhammad was a charlatan and had zero understanding of truth. Sadly, so few of his followers have discernment. People are so desperate to be fooled that prefer to keep their eyes shut, lest they see the light and find the truth about the deplorable predicament in which they are trapped.

You wrote: "Such an act will neither be an attempt to add anything to His knowledge nor will it be instrumental in altering His decision. It will be a mere plea expressed by some

individuals to seek mercy for some others who will be falling on the margin of good and bad performers".

If your plea is not going to give any new information to God and will in no way affect his decision, what is the point of making that plea? You might as well beseech forgiveness from a wall. Isn't that an exercise in futility?

You wrote that the Quran says "intercession would be allowed to those who speak the truth." Can anyone lie to an omniscient God? Then again, what is the point in saying anything to a God who knows everything better than you?

I explained these things already. These are simple logical arguments that debunk the whole theory of intercession. You did not bring anything new to the table. Therefore I rested my case. This does not mean I conceded.

You wrote: "In fact, it would be the supreme kindness of God that would allow some people to plead mercy for those people whom He will have already decided, but not openly announced, to forgive."

Really! I think it is sardonic to tell people pray earnestly but I will do as I please anyway and your prayers have no effect on my decision which is already made. How much respect does a judge deserve who makes his decision first and then listens patiently to the witnesses? Such a judge must be sick in the head. This is giving people false hope. The decision is already made and there would be no change in it but people are asked to pray. Pray for what? Such a sadistic god is scornful and not worthy of any praise. It is amazing that you can't see the irony.

One reader commented: "When Allah has already decided to forgive, there is no point in someone else to plead mercy for those people. Whether they plead or not, the decision is already been made to forgive."

Does this point need further clarification? As you can see, the whole concept of intercession is absurd. As rational people we must reject the very notion of intercession. I was glad to read that Dr. Ghamidi had already done that. But then when I quoted the Quranic verses that speak of intercession, you changed your position and felt the need to defend something totally irrational.

Now let us read the verses 4:17-18 again

> Repentance with Allah is only for those who do evil in ignorance, then turn (to Allah) soon, so these it is to whom Allah turns (mercifully), and Allah is ever Knowing, Wise. (category A)
>
> And repentance is not for those who go on doing evil deeds, until when death comes to one of them, he says: Surely now I repent; (category B) nor (for) those who die while they are unbelievers. (category C) These (B & C) are they for whom We have prepared a painful chastisement.

As you see, your understanding of these verses is not correct. The category B and C will not be forgiven. You are wasting your time praying and interceding. This verse says those who delay repentance will not be forgiven. You yourself are saying that God's decision will not be changed. Will you then explain what is the point of intercession? By defending the concept of intercession you are contradicting the above verse. But actually it is the Quran that contradicts itself. You are educated and smart men and yet by trying to defend a lunatic man you are engaging in all sort of irrationalities. Why? Why we have to sellout our intelligence to defend a madman of the seventh century? Why it is so hard to wake up, to come to our senses and to realize that we have been coned? Truth is manifest like the sun, why we don't want to see?

This is what faith does to people. Rational people do all sorts of mental acrobatics to prove something irrational because otherwise their entire belief system crumbles. However, since irrationality cannot be defended rationally, they end up saying irrational things. This is not a slight on you. I did the same when I was a believer. I said so many stupid things to cling to my faith until I could no longer fool myself and once I admitted that one thing is wrong, it had a domino effect and one after another I saw more absurdities that I had never paid attention to before. Islam is a house of cards. One lie is supported by another and all of them hold this religion together. Once one lie is removed this entire edifice of lies will fall at once. All you have to do is admit to one tiny error and at once you will see hundreds and thousands of them. That means the loss of faith. But losing faith is a painful rebirth. That is why Muslims cling to each and every lie so tenaciously. It is much easier to lie to ourselves and prolong our sojourn in the womb of ignorance than see the truth and face the uncertainty of freedom.

As for the second topic you clarified that you never said the Quran is poetry and that I am putting words in your mouth. Well, that is why we are having this discussion. If there is something I misunderstand, you can catch my error. No harm is done. It is good that both of us agree that the Quran is not a book of poetry.

However, you claim that because the Quran is an excellent piece of literature, it does not have to abide by the rules of grammar just as poets often break these rules. I stated that we allow poets to break all sorts of rules, including those of logic to inspire us but this privilege is not extended to someone claiming to have brought a divine book of guidance. Every book has to abide by its own rules. You would make a grave mistake if you try to write a book on science in a poetic language. When writing about science, what matters is clarity. This is also true about a book of guidance.

I also said that switching from one pronoun to another does not transform a prosaic writing into a masterpiece of literature. The main requisite for a book of guidance is clarity. Poets can be as ambiguous as they want, but messengers of God should not. On one hand you say the Quran is not a book of poetry and on the other hand you want us to overlook its poetic vagaries. You want to have your cake and eat it too. Nice try!

A book of guidance must not contain any ambiguity. The excellence of the writing should be attained while adhering to the rules of grammar and at the same time the book must be clear. The Quran does neither of the two. The Bible is an excellent literature. It is a readable book and unlike the Quran that is tedious, it is enjoyable. The Bible does not break any grammatical rules to defraud its readers pretending to be an “excellent literature”. It is an excellent literature precisely because it sticks to the norms of grammar and correct speech. Why the Bible is a masterpiece of literature? It is because its authors were learned rabbis and scholars while the author of the Quran was an illiterate man.

You say I am “agitated against the faith” and in my exuberance to get answers to them I assume that all Muslims, including you, are saying the same thing on those issues.

I am only questioning the Quran. What you believe or don’t believe is not of my concern. My objective is to prove that the Quran is not a divine book. I know that both you and Dr. Ghamidi are sensible and rational people and have a hard time believing in absurdities. All I want to do is to show how precarious is your position. As rational people you cannot defend Islam, which is utterly irrational.

Rationalism and Islam don’t mix any more than water and oil do. Take the example of intercession. What I read from Dr. Ghamidi in his site was very rational. He had quoted the verses (78:37-38) and in the footnote had written: “This and the next two verses strongly negate the philosophy of mediation and intercession.” However, when I showed that the Quran says quite something else also, you and Dr. Ghamidi changed your position on this subject and started to defend something you do not believe. Your options are to defend the indefensible and the irrational, or to admit that the Quran is wrong. Since the latter option is out of question, you will continue bending backwards and do all sorts of mental gymnastics to somehow justify the absurdity of your holy book. The case is clear and I do not need to dwell on it any longer. I prefer to move on to other subjects and once I show you that this book has as many wholes in it as wire mesh, you will eventually have to make a choice between rationality and Islam. What I want to arouse in you and in our Muslim readers is cognitive dissonance. Then it would be up to you and them to choose between reason and Islam.

Many people have chosen belief over reason. They are comfortable believing in absurdities and regard fideism superior to rationalism. I have no argument with them. Our paths simply do not cross. Intellectually, we operate in different planes. However, if you claim that Islam is compatible with reason, you are coming into our turf. Therefore I will ask questions and want proof. If you fail to produce the proof I will accuse you of false advertising.

On the question of an **animal acting as a messenger** of Allah you repeated what you already had said earlier that it is “used as a final measure to expose the indefensible stubbornness of the deniers of the message of God.” I have already answered this point in my previous message and therefore I won’t take the reader's time repeating what I already said.

You also say that the fact that other translators have translated the verse 27:82 differently does not mean that your translation is not right. As I said, even if we translate the verse in the way you have done it, i.e. assume that the emergence of this beast is only a probability, it is still irrational and does not change anything. If I tell you that tomorrow cats will rain; that would be an illogical statement. If I tell you that cats MAY rain, it does not become any more logical. Cats will never rain and animals will never become messengers of God. This idea is ludicrous.

On the subject of the **clarity of the Quran** you say “the clarity of a text is its intrinsic quality. Whether someone would be able to understand it would depend on whether he is making a genuine attempt at doing so or not.”

I beg to disagree. An obtuse text is obtuse no matter who reads it. You may not qualify me as capable of understanding the Quran because I have rejected it completely. Mind you, this has not been the case always. There was a time that I too, like you, believed in this book and realizing that it was all wrong was a painful experience. Now, let us say Allah has sealed my heart and as the result I do not understand it. (That in itself is an interesting topic to discuss.) What about the Muslims who sincerely believe in it? Why they understand the Quran in so many different ways? You disagree with the understanding of the suicide bombers, but do you doubt their sincerity? They are ready to die to prove their faith. Why they do not understand the Quran in the right way, the way you do? How many sects exist in Islam? Muslims read the same book but understand it in so many different ways. Why? Do we need more proof that this book is not clear? There are Muslims with whom you disagree. Some of them have even attempted to assassinate you. Isn't this enough proof that the Quran is not clear for them (or possibly for you)? Are you suggesting that you are the only one who reads the Quran in the right way? I hope not! The truth is that this book is not clear.

You say: “Qur’an was indeed absolutely clear and effective to its immediate addressees.”

Apart from the fact that you can’t possibly know this and are making an unsubstantiated claim, let us say that you are right. What about others who were or are not immediate addressees, like you and I and billions of others? Shouldn’t the book of God be clear to everyone? If the Quran is for all people and for all times, why only a handful of the immediate addressees should be able to understand it? This argument makes Allah unfair and a cynic who plays pranks with humans.

You say, “even today if one were to know the language of the Qur’anic times (for which the Qur’an itself is the best source) and decides to ignore all extraneous influences in favour of the Qur’an, its text is remarkably clear.”

I am not introducing a new topic but since you are making a claim I need clarification. Based on your claim I take that you are among those who understand the Quran. I am going to ask you to explain a few verses of this book. Let us start from the start. The Quran begins with Alif, Lam, Mim. What does that mean? There are many other disjointed letters in other surahs. Can you please explain to us the meaning of these letters? Then it says

Dhalika alkitabu la rayba feehi hudan lilmuttaqeena.

Dhalika means “that”. Which book this verse is talking about? If it is talking about the Quran, then the right pronoun is "this" book or **ha**dha al*kitabu.* Most translators have used their logic and corrected Muhammad's error. So they have translated *dhalika* as “this”. Arberry and Palmer, however, have stood by the correct meaning of the word and have translated it as “that”. (See here) Obviously the Quran is not clear to the extent that it has even confused its translators. Can you explain why instead of *this*, Allah says *that*? Is this also to make the book an excellent work of literature? It looks like Muhammad did not know how to use pronouns.

Then the verse continues: *la rayba feehi* (there is no doubt in it). I am sorry to inform you that the majority of mankind doubts this book and that is why they are not Muslims. Yours truly is one of them and I am putting all my doubts in this site for everyone to see and answer. So far no one has been able to do that. Let us hope that you will.

In my previous communication I asked you to interpret the following verses:

“The unbelievers are the vilest of animals” (8:55).

“Slay the unbelievers wherever they find them” (2:191)

“Fight them and show them harshness (9:123)

“Do not take them as friends and helpers (3:28)

And “Smite their necks” (47:4)

Will you please explain to us what do you understand from these verses? Since my heart is sealed, all I can understand is what I see and what I see is a message of hate and violence. You seem to understand the Quran differently. Please tell us what are the real meanings of these seemingly satanic verses?

I had promised to ask a new question this time. I will wait until you clarify the above verses. I see you have a lot to explain and I am not willing to burden you.

You stated: “The difficulty in understanding the Qur’an is similar to the difficulty one faces in understanding all other clear masterpieces the appreciation of subtleties of whose language and style of expression have become extinct save to those who have undertaken the trouble to master them.”

I am not sure which masterpieces you are referring to. But all the literary masterpieces I know are clear. All the philosophical theories presented by both antique and present thinkers that I have read were clear to me. The books discussing scientific theories are absolutely clear. I can read Dante, Shakespeare, the theory of relativity and the quantum physics and understand them. All I need are the meanings of the words, which I can find in a dictionary and I can easily understand what they say. Even the Bible and the Vedas are fairly

understandable. That is not the case with the Quran. I do not find any other book as obtuse than this book. The only clear message in the Quran is its message of violence. When it says strike terror, smite the necks of the unbelievers and chop their fingertips, it is very clear. Other than that nothing in this book is clear. If you allow me to go forward I will show how contradictory and confusing this book is. But maybe I am wrong. Will you please give us one example of literature that lends itself to this many interpretations as the Quran does?

If the Quran was clear why so many scholars had to write so many books of *tafseer* and compendiums to this book? You can read the Bible and understand it with no help from another book. But to understand the Quran you need *tafseer*. Doesn't the very existence of so many books of tafseer belie the claim that the Quran is a clear book?

Also if the subtleties of the language and style of expression of the Quran are lost to the masses of people, as you have stated, then doesn't this mean that the book has ceased to be a clear book of guidance for all times? Are you telling me that now only an elite can read and interpret the Quran and the rest of us should depend on them alone to tell us what God says. In that case Islam's days are over and it is time for Allah to send another messenger to speak to us in a language that we all can understand.

You insisted again that I should try to understand the scheme of Qur'anic presentation the way the Qur'an presents itself.

What makes you think that you understand the Quran better than me? For one thing you read the Quran subjectively, i.e. through the eyes of a believer. As such you are unable to see its errors objectively. This is normal. Believers are lovers and they cannot see the faults in the object of their love. This is your handicap, which has become clear in our discussion. In the case of intercession you wrote, and I repeat:

Such an act will neither be an attempt to add anything to the His knowledge nor will it be instrumental in altering His decision. It will be a mere plea expressed by some individuals to seek mercy for some others who will be falling on the margin of good and bad performers.

The contradiction in these two sentences is clear to any objective observer, but as a lover and a believer, you are unable to see it despite the fact that both of you are very rational persons with trained scientific minds. You Mr. Zaheer are a professor of physics. You know very well what rational thinking is and yet you make oxymoronic statements such as this that are anything but rational. Both of you are very intelligent and smart men. However you are forced to defend a very stupid and ignorant man and this is the result. Why do you do it? If Islam was from God, it would have been logical.

In the case of the **wanton use of pronouns** in the Quran you say these errors are to make the Quran a masterpiece of literature. I am afraid this beauty you are alluding to escapes the rest of mankind. Only Muslims see beauty and art in this jumble known as the Quran. So again yours is a subjective observation. I am afraid you are the ones who are disqualified to understand the Quran properly not me. Faith blinds. You say you love your prophet more than you love your parents. Would you trust a son to act as judge in a case involving his

father and mother? Because of this excessive love for Muhammad you are blinded to all his evilness and are disqualified to judge his actions and his words. You are the last person fit to pass judgment on the Quran and yet you say I am not allowed to do that. Far from it. I am the most qualified to do that because I have overcome my blind faith and now I can see this book in a very objective way that you can't.

Despite that, you have the opportunity to explain the above Quranic verses and tell us in what scheme you interpret them to make them sound less violent and less hatemongering. The ball is in your court.

You complained that I have burdened the readers with **"scores" of topics** that you fear will stir emotions in "some feeble minded followers."

I hope by followers you mean those who follow this debate because I do not have followers and think "following" is demeaning for rational people. You are right; only feebleminded people are followers. I am glad to say that the standard of the essays in faithfreedom.org is a tad above what you find in other sites. I may be a mediocre writer myself but with the exception of me our writers are among the best. As the result only intellectuals and strong minded people find this site attractive. Feebleminded people get offended and they go away.

Anyway, so far I have presented no more than three topics – the intercession, the wanton use of pronouns and the animal messenger. This is not "scores" of topics. Are there other topics on the table that I am not aware of? If you already feel overwhelmed by just three topics, are you sure you can defend the Quran that contains hundreds of absurdities, contradictions and errors?

I think these topics are exhaustively explained and our readers are also eager that we move to other topics. If you think you have not said everything and still want to add more, the floor is all yours. I am done and I have rested my case. I believe these three topics are crystal clear and there is no need for me to add anything more. Adhering to Occam's razor and lex parsimoniae (law of succinctness), I feel no more additions are needed for me to make my case any stronger.

You said that you believe in **freedom of thought and expression** and the reason you are reluctant to publish our debate in your site is that my tone is "uncivilized". I am sorry that my tone has been uncivilized but I assure you that I have not been aware of it myself. Maybe because I am too brute and churlish to even notice how uncivilized is my tone. However, I would really be grateful if you could kindly point out exactly where I have been uncivilized so I can correct myself and be more civilized in the future. I am not being sarcastic. I sincerely strive to improve myself everyday in everyway and would like to act like civilized people. Will you kindly help me by being more specific and show me exactly where I have been uncivilized?

Also if I am uncivilized isn't it to your advantage to publish my uncivilized messages on your site so everyone in Pakistan can see them and not be fooled by me? If you click on

the Muslims Comments in my site you will see that I have published all the insults that Muslims have hurled at my person. I do that because I want to show how these people lack civility and how vile they have become thanks to Islam. Are you trying to protect my reputation by hiding my incivility from your readers? Your job is to save the reputation of Muhammad not mine. On the contrary you must expose me. So it is okay to publish our messages.

You added: “freedom of expression is one thing and insulting someone’s revered personality is quite another.”

I will have to disagree with you here. Freedom of expression is also freedom to insult someone else’s revered personality and belief. Without such freedom there is no freedom. Beliefs don't have to be respected. They must be scrutinized, questioned and if proven wanting, discarded. There are all sorts of beliefs out there. If one has to watch his tongue to not say anything that may offend someone else’s belief, then one cannot say anything at all. There are people who have great reverence for Hitler. Are you suggesting no one should say anything against Hitler because someone might be offended? At this moment most of the North Koreans are led to believe that Kim Jung Il is some sort of divine personage. Should we hold our tongues and respect this brute monster because there are people who love him and will be offended if we criticize him? The followers of Jim Jones worshiped that psychopath to the extent that when a few of them managed to escape his cult and wrote against him, others assassinated them. This is true in the case of all cults. The cultists love their leader to the point of worshiping him and are extremely offended if anyone criticizes their leader. In fact this is the main difference between a cult and a religion. Jesus has been vilified on many occasions. Someone with questionable taste placed a crucifix in a jar of urine and call it art. Christians were upset, but mainly because the City of New York had allowed this aberrancy to be shown in the City’s Museum at tax payers (their) expense. The protest was against the Museum, not against that idiot "artist". He was never threatened and he has no fear for his life. In contrast Muslims rioted and killed innocent people when a few cartoons of Muhammad were drawn. This alone is enough proof that Islam is a cult and not a religion.

Who said beliefs should be respected? Only those who cannot defend their belief rationally want protection against criticism for their faith. Because their faith is disgusting they want to force others to respect their faith through legislation. If Muslims could answer the criticisms raised against Islam, they would not act so violently. They resort to censorship and violence precisely because they have failed in the arena of reason. Why the followers of no other religion act in this way and why the followers of cults do? It is because this behavior is cultic behavior. Islam is not a religion but an overgrown cult.

Take a look at the forum of our site. It is free for all to come and say anything they want. Many Muslims take this opportunity to come and insult me and yet no one will censor them. Insults don't hurt, I welcome good logic and can easily refute back logic. So why should we ban people at all?

Several Muslim countries have blocked our site because they are afraid of us. We are only a handful of ordinary people and yet, to use Muhammad's favorite expression, we have "cast terror in the hearts" of Muslim authorities worldwide, but unlike him without ever resorting to any violence or calling for it. This is the awesome power of truth.

Furthermore, I am not insulting Muhammad but telling things as they are. Muhammad slept with a child. The English word for an adult who finds a child sexually attractive is pedophile. These are the most despicable creatures I can think of. He raided unarmed civilians, killed their men and captured their woman and children, while looting their herds, camels and everything they owned. Such a person in English is called a marauder, a gangster. He slept with women captured in his raids right after slaying their husband, father and many of their relatives and allowed his followers to do the same. This in English is called rape. He ordered his followers to assassinate his critics. Such a person is called an assassin. He massacred entire populations while they were his prisoners of war. Such a person is called mass murderer. How do you want me to say these truths about this man without hurting your sensitivity? Why instead of playing victim don't you answer these charges and refute them once and for all? I have made these charges against Muhammad for many years and millions of people have read them and have spread the news. I am offering to remove these charges and apologize publicly if someone can prove me wrong. So if I lie, all you have to do is catch my lies and expose me as a liar. By censoring my site and by not publishing our debate you only validate what I say. Yes you can keep the Pakistanis in the dark a little longer, but the world is awakening and this means the end of Islam is approaching. This site is blocked in Pakistan , Saudi Arabia, Iran and many other Islamic countries. However the truth is spreading like wildfire. Others are taking up this banner and are taking this message far and wide.

Now, let us turn the table and see how good Muslims are in respecting the beliefs of others. Don't Muslims burn churches and synagogues? Don't they insult the deities of Hindus? Didn't they demolish the statute of Buddha in Bamian? You may say that those Muslims who do such things are ignorant, but what about Muhammad? Didn't he insult the Christians' belief of trinity, which he did not even understand? Didn't he insult and eventually destroy the icons of the Quraish? What right did he have to ram into Ka'ba and smash the icons that people held sacrosanct? That temple belonged to the Pagans. He had no right to confiscate it and destroy their idols.

You may say, but Muhammad did this because he was right and others were wrong. Isn't this what everyone thinks about his own belief? Should anyone who thinks he is right kill those who disagree with him and destroy their houses of worship? Don't you agree that the reason Muslims have caused so much havoc throughout these centuries, destroyed thousands of temples in Iran , India and elsewhere and killed your and my ancestors is because they followed the examples of their prophet? Yes it is despicable for you and I to take the side of those who butchered our forefathers.

You ask me not to accuse Muhammad of any crime until I can prove my case. I have actually proven all my charges against him already. If you allow me to carry on, I will prove them to

you too. I think you should let go of these three topics. You have already said what you could say and now you are repeating yourself. Let us move on. As I said, if you can disprove anyone of my charges I will remove them and apologize publicly. So instead of getting offended, let us go through these charges and see if you can show to the world that I am mistaken. This will have a much better impact than saying I should not say anything bad about Muhammad because your skin is delicate and your feelings are tender. Such an evasive strategy hardly convinces anyone. Muslims have been playing that game of victimization that ad nauseam and people are developing an adverse reaction to it. The world has had enough of Muslims sensitivity and they do not give a damn anymore. It is time to tell the truth. If you can't stand the truth that is your problem. Prove me wrong or put up with the rising anger of the world. We have had it up to here. Enough with hypocrisy, enough with lies, enough with terrorism and taqiyyah and enough with your game of victimization. .

Then you conclude your message with an ultimatum that “if we see any nonsense hurled at our prophet in your future messages to us, this discussion would discontinue there and then.”

First of all none of my charges against Muhammad are nonsense. These are grave and serious charges that definitely show Muhammad was not fit to be called a good man let alone a messenger of God. What he did deserve contempt not praise. Anyone doing a fraction of Muhammad did today would be rotting in jail or would be condemned to electric chair. Secondly, how else am I supposed to prove my case if I am not allowed even to bring my charges against your defendant? You are asking me to prove my charges without even laying any charge against him. How can that be done?

The reason Islam has survived so long is precisely because of this fallacious strategy. Muslims will resort to threats in order to intimidate their critics and silence them and then claim victory. That is why a real discussion between Muslim scholars and the critics of Islam has never taken place. The reason is that Muslims cannot tolerate criticism of their prophet. Why? It is because they can’t respond to them. As soon as they realize their position is precarious they find an excuse to copout.

I know all this talk hurts you. It hurt me too when I first saw the light of the truth. However, I was all on my own. I could not withdraw from the debate because this debate was taking place in my head. Yes, it was painful. But I was already in the throes of the cognitive dissonance and had to choose. I am happy that I chose reason over blind faith. I decided that an irrational god is no one but Satan and did not want to believe in Satan. You and other Muslims must make this choice on your own.

How do you think your pulling out at this stage will be interpreted by our readers? You can bring all the face saving excuses in the world saying I am uncivilized, I insult your prophet, your feelings are hurt, etc, but people are smart and they know why you don’t want to continue. They only conclude that you have run out of answers. If you had answers you would patiently go through all my charges and contest them one by one. So far I have asked only three questions and they look to you "scores" and you already want to back out.

If I am lying, I am influencing millions of people. Why not bite the bullet, continue this debate, expose my lies and put an end to me ones and for all? If you are right, at the end the victory will be yours and who laughs last, laughs more. Actually if you can prove me wrong I will be grateful. This is a golden opportunity. Forget about me. Look with indulgence at my incivility and at my unscholarly nonsensical rambling. Keep in mind that it is not for me that you write. You are writing to enlighten many people, both Muslims and non-Muslims, who wonder why no Muslim scholar has yet managed to answer me and to put an end to this site. Many of them have started to believe that maybe I am right after all. Many have left Islam already. These people will talk to other Muslims and make them doubt too and the snowball will keep growing until Islam falls like an avalanche and will be melted and washed away under the heat of the sun of truth. If Islam is the right religion, shouldn’t you overlook my incivility with your magnanimity and forbearance and think about helping these people whom I am misleading?

Please don't leave us dear Doctor Ghamidi and Professor Zaheer yet. The night is long and we have just begun. I only served you a little appetizer. You must try the main course. I have prepared for you a great feast. The dishes are ready in the kitchen. Allow me to set the table. I promise to bring one dish at a time so you don not get indigestion. One is more succulent than the other and I want you to relish each one separately.

All the best

Ali Sina